

Department of **Environmental Quality**

Amanda Smith Executive Director

DIVISION OF AIR QUALITY Bryce C. Bird Director

DAO-040-13

MEMORANDUM

TO:

Air Quality Board

THROUGH: Bryce C. Bird, Executive Secretary

FROM:

Jay Morris, Minor Source Compliance Section Manager

DATE:

May 24, 2013

SUBJECT:

Amico-Klemp Company Recommended Approval.

In November 2012, Division staff calculated a penalty for Amico-Klemp Company of \$90,200 to resolve repeat violations of the Utah Air Quality Rules at their industrial grating manufacturing facility in Orem. In accordance with Utah Code Ann. § 19-2-104(3)(b)(i), the Board must review a settlement negotiated by the director in accordance with Subsection 19-2-107 (2)(b)(viii) that requires a civil penalty of \$25,000 or more; and approve or disapprove the settlement. This rule became effective on May 8, 2012.

In an inadvertent oversight by Division staff, we failed to bring the Amico-Klemp Company early settlement proposal to the Board for your review in accordance with the above rule. The company has since agreed to the terms of the proposal and has signed the early settlement agreement. The Amico-Klemp Company settlement was the first and only settlement in 2012 that included a recommended penalty over \$25,000. Thus, this settlement is the only settlement that was not brought before the Board under the newly-effective Utah Code Ann. §19-2-104(3)(b)(i).

Staff would like to provide the details of the settlement to the Board at this time. This was a repeat violation of a 12-month rolling volatile organic compound (VOC) emission limit at Amico-Klemp Company. The Division cited the company for exceeding the limit in 2009. During the 2012 compliance inspection, the company reported they had exceeded the VOC limit significantly for over 39 straight rolling 12-month periods.

The Division offered Amico-Klemp Company an early settlement offer for \$90,200. Under the terms of the settlement agreement, of the \$90,200 penalty amount, \$45,100 will be paid in cash in eighteen equal monthly payments of \$2,505.56. The remaining \$45,100 of the stipulated penalty will be deferred, but payable if Amico-Klemp Company, at any of its operations within the State, violates the provisions of this Agreement, the Utah Air Conservation Act, the Air Quality Rules, or Orders issued by the Director within DAQ-040-13 Page 2

two years following the date of this Agreement. If Amico-Klemp Company does not violate this Agreement, the Act, Rules, or Orders within the next two years, the remaining \$45,100 of the stipulated penalty will be waived.

Amico-Klemp Company signed the early settlement and submitted the first payment of \$2,505.56 in April 2013. The signed early settlement agreement and penalty calculation was provided for your review in the Board packet. The Division entered into an early settlement agreement with Amico-Klemp Company in an effort to bring the facility into compliance and to avoid the time and the expense of a formal compliance process.

<u>Recommendation</u>: Staff recommends the Board approve and uphold the penalty amount and early settlement offer.



GREG BELL
Lieutenant Governor

Department of Environmental Quality

Amanda Smith
Executive Director

DIVISION OF AIR QUALITY Bryce C. Bird Director



DAQC-142-13 Site ID 13089(B1)

February 6, 2013

Hand Delivered

Steve Sherwood Amico-Klemp Company 212 North 1330 West Orem, UT 84059

Dear Mr. Sherwood:

Re: Early Settlement Agreement - Amico-Klemp Company - Utah County

On October 3, 2012, the Utah Division of Air Quality (DAQ) issued a Compliance Advisory to Amico-Klemp Company. On October 19, 2012, Amico-Klemp Company responded to the Compliance Advisory. Based on the findings of the inspection and the response to the Compliance Advisory, the DAQ determined that Amico-Klemp Company is in violation of:

Condition 8 of Approval Order DAQE-AN0130890003-08, dated August 11, 2008. According to received, Amico-Klemp Company has been out of compliance with the VOC limit every month since the previous inspection, August 19, 2009.

Section 19-2-115 of the Utah Code Annotated provides that violations of the Utah Air Conservation Act and/or any order issued thereunder may be subject to a civil penalty of up to \$10,000 per day for each violation. Based upon our civil penalty policy, we calculated a preliminary civil penalty for the above listed violations of \$90,200.00. The monetary amount of the DAQ settlement offer specified below is derived from a pre-established schedule of penalties, which takes into account, among other factors, the magnitude and severity of the violation, cooperation of the source as well as the prior history of violations. All parties we deal with, whether private, commercial, or governmental are treated similarly in the settlement process. Settlement offers are based on the evaluation of the same factors and criteria in all cases.

If you are interested in settling this violation, we are authorized to offer settlement in accordance with the DAQ Penalty Policy as follows:

Amico-Klemp Company agrees to pay \$45,100.00 of the \$90,200.00 stipulated penalty in cash.
 Monthly payments of \$2,505.56 will be paid by the first business day of each month for 18
 months. The remaining \$45,100.00 of the stipulated penalty shall be deferred and payable if
 Amico-Klemp Company, at any of its operations within the State, violates the provisions of this
 Agreement, the Act, Rules, or Orders issued by the Director (Orders) within two years following

the date of this Agreement. However, if Amico-Klemp Company, does not violate this Agreement, the Act, Rules, or Orders within the next two years, the remaining \$45,100.00 of the stipulated penalty shall be waived.

- 2. The DAQ retains its authority to take any enforcement actions based on any and all violations not specifically described above.
- 3. In the event any further violations of the Utah Air Quality Rules occur, the DAQ may consider the violation described above in assessing a penalty for the subsequent violations, in accordance with the provisions of Utah Administrative Code R307-130.
- 4. Entering into this settlement shall not constitute an admission of violation of the Utah Air Quality Rules, nor shall it be inferred to be such an admission in any administrative or judicial proceeding. The described violation will constitute part of the company compliance history for any purpose for which such history is relevant to the DAQ.

This letter constitutes an offer of settlement and is not a demand for payment. If the above terms are acceptable to you, please sign and return this Early Settlement Agreement and a check in the sum of \$2,505.56, made payable to the DAQ at the letterhead address within twenty (20) business days of receipt of this letter. The 17 remaining monthly payments of \$2,505.56 will be due by the first business day of each month. If a monthly payment is not paid on time, the remaining balance of the \$45,100.00 will be due by the first business day of the following month.

You may write or call to request a settlement conference with DAQ representative listed below. A conference must be scheduled within twenty (20) business days of your receipt of this Early Settlement Offer. If we do not receive a signed copy of this letter and payment or other correspondence from you within twenty (20) business days of your receipt of this letter, we will assume that you are not interested in resolving this matter as outlined above.

This Early Settlement Agreement is intended to quickly resolve the non-compliance issues listed above and requires the immediate attention of your company. Failure to resolve this matter as outlined in this letter may result in this offer being revoked and/or having this matter referred to a formal enforcement process.

If you have any additional questions regarding this matter, please contact Jay Morris at (801) 536-4079 or at jpmorris@utah.gov.

Sincerely,

Bryce C. Bird

Director

BCB:JPM:bp

Enclosures: Penalty Calculation and Criteria

cc: Terry Beebe, Utah County Health Department

DAQC-142-13 Page 3

Acceptance of Early Settlement Agreement

I have read the above Early Settlement Agreement and I agree to the terms and conditions thereof.

Amico-Klemp Company

Name:

Title:

 Cean
 Obndy
 4-18-13
 205 783 6228

 Signature
 Date
 Telephone Number

Utab Division of Air Quality	General Administrative Penalty Worksheet		1000 ja 1100 ja 100 ja						
Amico-Klemp Company			r	В					
13089 No		IJ ĸ	С	9/18/2012					Home
		- ÿ	i i	 -				1	
		e	ŀ	Gravity Criteria (Gc)					Gravity Criteria
Table 1: Gravity Criteria		^ ?	8						
		5	°	۱	م ـ ۱	۱	اء ـ ـ ا	Daily	Accumulated
Citation	Description of the Violation	1	Į,	GC I	Gc 2	GCS	964	Gravity	Gravity
Condition 8 of Approval Order		1	1	1					
AN0130890003-08, dated August	Exceedance of VOC limit (25 tons per rolling 12 month	12	В	3	3	3	0		
11, 2008	period)			1				\$7,000	\$84,000
			1						
			₩_	 	-		 	71, 1140 0	
Car Umayar at Unions	ALCON MARKON MARKANIA		1	ا	J.,	<u> </u>			
Gc 5 History of violations within	Time tast live (5) years			444.0.7	diagra, i				
Date of Early Settlement/NOV	Description of Early Settlement/NOV				1 1	Cat	egory		
1/6/2010 - 9/17/2009							\$2,000		
		情	Same	Violatio	n	1			## 15 5 S.
		╼				}			
			Same	Violatio	n				
			Same	Violatio	n				
		TIT	Camo	Violatio	•	1			
	 		Jame	VANGUA		1			***
	Total Gravity								\$86,000
Table 2: Adjustments									
Other	\$4200 - SEP credit from previous CA to implement an environmental management system								
A 4.5 S	Early Settlement Reduction (20%) -		3 01 -						
Total Penalty									\$90,200
Gravity Criteria Definitions									
	t of excess emissions and/or reporting?		Ting.		-				
0	If the violation was not a result of excess emissions and/o					:83:			
	If a minor reporting or other problem occurred, but no emissions were involved:								
	If a reporting or other problem occurred which involved minor emissions								
. 3	If a reporting or other problem occurred involving signific	ant em	155101	ıs					
Gc 2. Did the violation appear	to be willful or due to gross negligence?								
0	If the source clearly did not know that the action/inaction	constit	uted a	violat	ion				
	If the source should have known that the action/inaction would result in a minor violation								
	If the source clearly knew that the action/inaction would result in a minor violation								
	If the source clearly knew that the action/inaction would r	esult in	a sig	nificar	t viola	tion			
a consiste to a						1 78 10	a wiley		
Co 2 Mac the winterer uproces	motivo in newsorting the violation?			e nnec	ible				
	onsive in correcting the violation? If the source was consentive and the violation was correct	ted so	non		1011				
Gc 3. Was the violator unresponds 0 1	If the source was cooperative and the violation was correct					r		•	
0	If the source was cooperative and the violation was correct the source was cooperative but the violation was correct	ted in a							
	If the source was cooperative and the violation was correct	ted in a lem	less	timely				And the second s	
0 1 2 3	If the source was cooperative and the violation was correct if the source was cooperative but the violation was correct if the source was not cooperative but did correct the probility the source was not cooperative and did not attempt to cooperative.	ted in a lem orrect t	less	timely					
0 1 2 3 Gc 4. Was the violation a resu	If the source was cooperative and the violation was correct if the source was cooperative but the violation was correct if the source was not cooperative but did correct the probing the source was not cooperative and did not attempt to continuous to improper operation or inadequate maintenance?	ted in a lem <u>orrect t</u>	tess	timely oblem	manne				
0 1 2 3 Gc 4. Was the violation a resu 0	If the source was cooperative and the violation was correct if the source was cooperative but the violation was correct if the source was not cooperative but did correct the probif the source was not cooperative and did not attempt to continuous to firmproper operation or inadequate maintenance? If the source was following an acceptable O & M plan at	ted in a lem orrect t	t less he pro	timely oblem	monne	irred			
0 1 2 3 Gc 4. Was the violation a resu	If the source was cooperative and the violation was correct if the source was cooperative but the violation was correct if the source was not cooperative but did correct the probing the source was not cooperative and did not attempt to continuous to improper operation or inadequate maintenance?	ted in a lem orrect t the time & M pla	t less he pro- e the in at t	timely oblem violation he time	manne on occu	irred	ı occurr	ed	

R307-130. General Penalty Policy

R307-130-1 Scope.

This policy provides guidance to the executive secretary of the Air Quality Board in negotiating with air pollution sources penalties for consent agreements to resolve non-compliance situations. It is designed to be used to determine a reasonable and appropriate penalty for the violations based on the nature and extent of the violations, consideration of the economic benefit to the sources of non-compliance, and adjustments for specific circumstances.

R307-130-2. Categories.

Violations are grouped in four general categories based on the potential for harm and the nature and extent of the violations. Penalty ranges for each category listed:

Category A - \$7,000 to \$10,000 per day

Violations with high potential for impact on public health and the environment including:

- (a) Violations of emission standards and limitations of NESHAP
- (b) Emissions contributing to non-attainment area or PSD increment exceedaences.
- (c) Emissions resulting in documented public health effects and/or environmental damage

Category B \$2,000 to \$7,000 per day

Violations of the Utah Air Conservation Act, applicable state and federal regulations, and orders to include:

- (a) Significant levels of emissions resulting from violations of emission limitations or other regulations not within Category A
- (b) Substantial non-compliance with monitoring requirements.
- (c) Significant violations of approval orders, compliance orders, and consent agreements not within Category A
- (d) Significant and/or knowing violations of "notice of intent" and other notification requirements.
- (e) Violations of reporting requirements

Category C Up to \$2,000 per day

Minor violations of the Utah Air Conservation Act, applicable state and federal regulations, and orders having no significant public health or environmental impact to include:

- (a) Reporting violations
- (b) Minor violations of monitoring requirements, orders and agreements.
- (c) Minor violations of emission limitations or other regulatory requirements

Category D Up to \$299.00

Violations of specific provisions of which are considered minor to include:

- (a) Violations of automobile emission standards and requirements.
- (b) Violation of wood-burning regulations by private individuals
- (c) Open burning violations by private individuals